REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed July 30, 2003.

Applicants by way of this Amendment have amended claims 1 and 3 and added new claims 4 through 48. Claims 1-48 are pending in the application.

Applicants have also amended paragraph 1 of the specification to insert the patent numbers of the related patents. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made herein.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,052,411 to Mueller et al. ("Mueller").

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mueller in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,455,730 to Greszczuk et al. ("Greszczuk").

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to Mueller

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 2 are not anticipated by Mueller. Mueller discloses a DSL modem transmitter negotiating with a remote DSL modem receiver "in order to signal when to enter idle mode" (Mueller, col. 5, l. 15 to col. 6, l. 6). After the negotiation is completed, each modem transmitter and receiver enters into an idle state. (Mueller, col. 4, ll. 15-17). During the idle state, an idle mode modulated symbol is generated and repeatedly transmitted between the modem transmitter and receiver. (Mueller, col. 6, ll. 7-53). Mueller also discloses a detector at the receiver to determine whether the received symbol is the specific idle mode modulated symbol. (Mueller, col. 6, ll. 55-67).

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Claim 1 is distinct over such an idle mode negotiation taught by Mueller. For example, Mueller fails to teach a controller that detects whether or not the DSL transceiver has neither received nor transmitted non-idle data over the DSL channel for a first predetermined period of time, as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Mueller fails to disclose a selective processing subsection that omits at least some of the processing for reception of non-idle data from the DSL channel when the controller detects that the DSL transceiver has neither received nor transmitted non-idle data over the DSL channel for the first predetermined period of time, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Mueller. Given that claim 2 depends on claim 1, claim 2 is patentable over Mueller for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to Mueller in view of Greszczuk

Applicants respectfully submit that Greszczuk fails to cure the deficiencies of Mueller with respect to claims 1 and 2. Like Mueller, Greszczuk fails to teach a controller that detects whether or not the DSL transceiver has neither received nor transmitted non-idle data over the DSL channel for a first predetermined period of time, as recited in claim 1. Greszczuk also fails to teach a selective processing subsection that omits at least some of the processing for reception of non-idle data from the DSL channel when the controller detects that the DSL transceiver has neither received nor transmitted non-idle data over the DSL channel for the first predetermined period of time, as recited in claim 1.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Instead, Greszczuk discloses a multicarrier transceiver that enters a sleep mode and idles at reduced power consumption when it is not transmitting or receiving data. (Greszczuk col. 5 ll. 52-55). The receiver may receive a power down indication from, for example, an external source or the indication may be generated within the transceiver itself by monitoring an input buffer of the transmitter and determining that no data has been applied to the input buffer for a given time period or that the input buffer has not been filled despite passage of a symbol time. (Greszczuk col. 6 ll. 16-21)

Accordingly, Greszczuk fails to teach at least the controller and selective processing subsection elements as recited in claim 1. Therefore, given that claims 2 and 3 depend on claim 1, for at least the above reasons, claims 1-3 are allowable over Mueller and Greszczuk individually or in combination.

New Claims 4 through 48 are Allowable Over Muller and Greszczuk

Similar to claim 1, independent new claims 9 and 17 recite a method and system having a combination of elements for detecting the reception of idle data over the DSL channel for a first predetermined period of time; and omitting at least some of the processing of the data in the received DSL signal in response to detecting the reception of idle data over the DSL channel for the first predetermined period of time. Thus, Applicants further respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 17 are likewise allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1-3. Applicants additionally respectfully submit that claims 10-16, and 18-25 that depend from independent claims 9 and 17 are likewise allowable at least due to their dependence on allowable claims 9 and 17.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Additionally, new independent claim 25 and 37 recite a system and method having a combination of elements that omits a plurality of processing for responding to the data traffic in response to the data traffic detector detecting that there is no data traffic over the DSL channel, which is neither taught or suggested by Mueller nor Greszczuk, individually or in combination, as noted above. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26-36 and 38-48 that depend from independent claims 25 and 37 are likewise allowable at least due to their dependence on allowable claims 25 and 37.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 30, 2003

By: _____
S.H. Michael Kim
Reg. No. 40,450

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

Express Mail Label No.: EV 398930712 US

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Services "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. § 1.10, addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date below.

Date: **December 30, 2003** Signed: _____
Linda Phillips

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com